IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.GIRI

WEDNESDAY, THE 12TH DECEMBER 2007 / 21ST AGRAHAYANA 1929

Con.Case(C).No. 1688 of 2007(S)

AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT/ORDER IN WPC.4876/2006 Dated 30/08/2006.

.....

PETITIONER/PETITIONER

----

1. **D.MURALEEDHARAN PILLAI,**
   AGED 52 YEARS, S/O DAMODAN PILLAI,
   PART-TIME SWEEPER, CHAKKUVARACKAL VILLAGE OFFICE,
   KOTTARAKARA TALUK, KOLLAM DISTRICT.

2. **R.PRASANDHA, AGED 36 YEARS,**
   W/O BHASKARAN, PART-TIME SWEEPER,
   VALAKOM VILLAGE OFFICE, KOTTARAKARA TALUK,
   KOLLAM DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.M.V.THAMBAN

RESPONDENTS: RESPONDENTS

----

1. **DR. NIVEDITHA P.HARAN, IAS,**
   AGE AND FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER,
   WORKING AS SECRETARY TO THE GOVT.,
   DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, GOVT. SECRETARIAT,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. **K.SADANANDAN PILLAI,**
   AGE AND FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER,
   WORKING AS COMMISSIONER FOR LAND REVENUE,
   DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. **SHAJAHAN, IAS,**
   AGE AND FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER,
   WORKING AS DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
   CIVIL STATION, KOLLAM.

COC. NO.1688/2007

4. SALIM RAJ,
AGE AND FATHER'S NAME NOT KNOWN TO THE PETITIONER,
WORKING AS TAHSILDAR, KOTTARAKARA TALUK,
KOTTARAKARA P.O., KOLLAM DISTRICT.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.BEJOY CHANDRAN

THIS CONTEMPT OF COURT CASE (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 12/12/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

V.GIRI, J.

==========

COC NO.1688 OF 2007

==========

Dated this the 12th day of December 2007

JUDGMENT

Contempt is alleged in relation to Annexure-III judgment. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there is a total lack of understanding of the directions in Annexure-IV judgment which was followed by this Court, while passing Annexure-III judgment in the case of the petitioners. On going through Ext.R1(a) order, I am not in a position to find that the contention is without substance. But nevertheless, the remedy of the petitioners is not under the Contempt of Court's Act.

Without prejudice to the right of the petitioners to challenge Ext.R1(a) and seek appropriate reliefs, the Contempt of Court Case is closed.

V.GIRI, JUDGE

css/